



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/692,502

10/24/2003

Hiroki Koyano

CFA00016US

9274

34904

7590

07/25/2008

CANON U.S.A. INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
15975 ALTON PARKWAY
IRVINE, CA 92618-3731

EXAMINER

ZHENG, JACKY X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,502	Applicant(s) KOYANO, HIROKI	
	Examiner JACKY X. ZHENG	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on April 24, 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19,20,22-25,28-32 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19,20,22-25,28-32 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on October 24, 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the office action based on a request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 filed on April 24, 2008.
2. **Claims 19, 22, 25, 29, 32 and 36** have been amended.
3. **Claims 1-18, 21, 26-27 and 33-34** have been cancelled.
4. **Claims 19-20, 22-25, 28-32 and 35-38** are currently pending.

Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 24, 2008 has been entered.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to because Figures 1-14 each has component label(s) not clearly and/or correctly illustrated, such as: in Fig. 1, 110 "PRNTER" (PRINTER), Fig. 2, 202, "DRECTORY NFORMATION" (DIRECTORY INFORMATION) and similar issues are also found in the remaining of the drawings; Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number

Art Unit: 2625

of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. **Claims 19, 22, 25, 29, 32 and 36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 19, 25 and 32 are *newly* amended with limitations of “*a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms included in the composite form file*”, and Applicant has not indicated the places in the disclosure for the supports, and Examiner

Art Unit: 2625

has not able to find any *explicit* disclosure that supports the limitations of “*a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms included in the composite form file*”. Therefore, claims 19, 25 and 32 are rejected for the abovementioned reasons, at least until the further clarification from Applicant indicating that such limitations are indeed being *explicitly* disclosed in the original disclosure at the time of the application filed.

Claims 22, 29 and 36 are *newly* amended with limitations of “*setting display further include a name of each of the plurality of forms as identical information*”, and Applicant has not indicated the places in the disclosure for the supports, and Examiner has not able to find any *explicit* disclosure that supports the limitations of “*setting display further include a name of each of the plurality of forms as identical information*”. Therefore, claims 22, 29 and 36 are rejected for the abovementioned reasons, at least until the further clarification from Applicant indicating that such limitations are indeed being *explicitly* disclosed in the original disclosure at the time of the application filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 19-20, 22, 25, 28-29, 32 and 35-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,483,999) and further in view of **Turpin et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,745,712).

With regard to claim 19, the claim is drawn to an information processing apparatus that outputs document data, comprising means for displaying, selecting, setting and generating a halt command. Anderson et al. disclose an invention relates to “a combination printer/copier” apparatus which is capable of triggering the interrupt sequence. Anderson et al. further disclose the limitations of: a display (*see Anderson et al., i.e. Fig. 1, 22*) as the displaying screen, a keypad (*Fig. 1, 24*) as means for selecting, a copy button (*Fig. 1, 25*) as the setting means for initiating the interrupting or halting command, a print controller (*Fig. 2, 19*) as the means for generating the interrupt sequence (or halting command) and generating of the print job, and image forming devices, such as inkjet or dot-matrix impact printer for example, as the outputting means. In addition, i.e. in Anderson et al. Figure 3, Step 33, disclose step of "comparing the current job parameters (or determining) to interrupt job parameter to determine if there is a conflict" and to further “evaluate the current job for a possible stopping point” (Anderson et al. i.e. col. 4, ln 11-14).

Anderson et al. do not *explicitly* disclose the newly-recited limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms.

However, Turpin et al. disclose an invention relates to a system for creation and completion of goal-oriented electronic forms creates a graphical image data file which defines: a graphical image of a form for display and printing (*see Turpin et al. i.e. “Abstract”*); More specifically, Turpin et al. also disclose "identification information of the plurality of forms", such as the ones illustrated in Figures 9, 13-14, 16 and etc., showing the windows displays with "identification information" of "Life Insurance Company" on top of the application forms as well as various "identification information" relating to the fields within the forms.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. to include the limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms taught by Turpin et al. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. by the teachings of Turpin et al. to include the limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms taught by Turpin et al., thereby "*provides a set of intuitive "creation" tools which readily permit creation of ...the form files*" (col. 2, ln 66 - col. 3, ln 1).

With regard to claims 20 and 22, the claims are drawn to an information processing apparatus according to claim 19 and 20 respectively, further comprising "form generating means" and "setting display" further include a name of each of the plurality of forms as "identical information". See the detailed discussions of the limitations required for the base claim of these dependent claims above.

Anderson et al. do not *explicitly* disclose the limitations of "form generating means", "setting display" further include a name of each of plurality of forms as identical information.

However, Turpin et al. disclose a system for creation and completion of "goal oriented electronic forms" that creates a graphical image data file which defines a graphical image of a form for display and printing (see Turpin et al., i.e. "Abstract", ln 1-3; col. 2, ln 34-41), and further disclose "a graphical image of tree branches, tree nodes and conclusions in association with fields of the form" (see i.e. "Abstract", Figures 24-26). Turpin et al. also disclose "identification information of the plurality of forms", such as the ones illustrated in Figures 9,

13-14, 16 and etc., showing the windows displays with "identification information" of "Life Insurance Company" on top of the application forms as well as various "identification information" relating to the fields within the forms.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. to include the limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms taught by Turpin et al. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. by the teachings of Turpin et al. to include the limitation of "form generating means" and "setting display" taught by Turpin et al., thereby *"provides a set of intuitive "creation" tools which readily permit creation of ...the form files"* (col. 2, ln 66 - col. 3, ln 1).

With regard to claim 25, the claim is drawn to a print processing control method that generates a print job based on a composite form file including a plurality of forms and page data which is laid on the form, the method comprising: displaying, selecting, setting, generating a halt command, generating the print job and sending the print job. Anderson et al. disclose an invention relates to "a combination printer/copier" apparatus which is capable of triggering the interrupt sequence. Anderson et al. further disclose the limitations of: a display (*see Anderson et al., i.e. Fig. 1, 22*) as the displaying screen for displaying, a keypad (*Fig. 1, 24*) as means for selecting, a copy button (*Fig. 1, 25*) as the setting means for initiating the interrupting or halting command, a print controller (*Fig. 2, 19*) as the means for generating the interrupt sequence (or halting command) and generating of the print job, and image forming devices, such as inkjet or

Art Unit: 2625

dot-matrix impact printer for example, as the outputting means. In addition, i.e. in Anderson et al. Figure 3, Step 33, disclose step of "comparing the current job parameters (or determining) to interrupt job parameter to determine if there is a conflict" and to further "evaluate the current job for a possible stopping point" (Anderson et al. i.e. col. 4, ln 11-14).

Anderson et al. do not *explicitly* disclose the newly-recited limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms.

However, Turpin et al. disclose an invention relates to a system for creation and completion of goal-oriented electronic forms creates a graphical image data file which defines: a graphical image of a form for display and printing (see Turpin et al. i.e. "Abstract"); More specifically, Turpin et al. also disclose "identification information of the plurality of forms", such as the ones illustrated in Figures 9, 13-14, 16 and etc., showing the windows displays with "identification information" of "Life Insurance Company" on top of the application forms as well as various "identification information" relating to the fields within the forms.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. to include the limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms taught by Turpin et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. by the teachings of Turpin et al. to include the limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms taught by Turpin et al., thereby "*provides a set of intuitive "creation" tools which readily permit creation of ...the form files*" (col. 2, ln 66 - col. 3, ln 1).

With regard to claim 28, the claim is drawn to a print processing control method according to claim 25, and further require “a form generating means”. (*See Turpin et al., i.e. claims 24-27 for further disclose of application software for creating “forms”*).

With regard to claim 29, the claim is drawn to a print processing control method according to claim 25, further comprising “setting display” includes a name of each of the plurality of forms as "identical information”.

Anderson et al. do not *explicitly* disclose the limitations of “setting display” further include a name of each of plurality of forms as identical information.

However, Turpin et al. disclose a system for creation and completion of “goal oriented electronic forms” that creates a graphical image data file which defines a graphical image of a form for display and printing (*see Turpin et al., i.e. “Abstract”, ln 1-3; col. 2, ln 34-41*), and further disclose “a graphical image of tree branches, tree nodes and conclusions in association with fields of the form” (*see i.e. “Abstract”, Figures 24-26*). Turpin et al. also disclose "identification information of the plurality of forms", such as the ones illustrated in Figures 9, 13-14, 16 and etc., showing the windows displays with "identification information" of "Life Insurance Company" on top of the application forms as well as various "identification information" relating to the fields within the forms.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. to include the limitation of displaying a setting display including images and identification information of the plurality of forms taught by Turpin et al. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to have modified Anderson et al. by the teachings of Turpin et al. to include the limitation of “form generating means” and “setting display” taught by Turpin et al., thereby *"provides a set of intuitive "creation" tools which readily permit creation of ...the form files"* (col. 2, ln 66 - col. 3, ln 1).

With regard to claim 32, the claim is drawn to a computer-readable storage medium stores a print processing control program to generates a print job based on a composite form file including a plurality of forms and page data which is laid on the form, the print processing control program having the *substantially identical* limitations recited and discussed in claim 25 *(The claim is rejected under the same ground for at least the reasons set forth above. See the detailed discussion of the claim 25 above. Further, Turpin et al. clearly disclose the implementation of the methods can be realized by program or software, i.e. GUI).*

With regard to claim 35, the claim is drawn to a computer-readable storage medium stores a print processing control program according to claim 32, and further require “a form generating means” . *(See Turpin et al., i.e. claims 24-27 for further disclose of application software for creating “forms”).*

With regard to claim 36, the claim is drawn to a computer-readable storage medium stores a print processing control program according to claim 32, further having the *substantially identical* limitations recited and discussed in claim 29 above *(The claims are rejected under the same ground for at least the reasons set forth above. See the detailed discussion of the claim 29*

above. In addition, Turpin et al. clearly disclose the implementation of the methods can be realized by program or software, i.e. GUI).

11. **Claims 23-24, 30-31 and 37-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** and **Turpin et al.**, further in view of **Johnson et al.** (US. Pub. No. 2002/021454).

With regard to claims 23 and 24, the claims are drawn to an information processing apparatus according to claim 19, further requiring the process of halting to be initiated by either a user or upon a expiration of a specific time period as claimed in claim 23; and capability of halting either the print job for specific page or the print job as a whole as claimed in claim 24. In addition to the teachings disclosed by Anderson et al. indicated above, the prior art further discloses “the interrupt sequence queries the user for the interrupt copy job parameter...the user accepts the default setting and initiates the interrupt copy job by depression of a single button...” (see Anderson et al., i.e. “Abstract”, ln 3-6); and further discloses that the control signal could also be rely upon the parameters, such as “approximate time left, etc.” (i.e. col. 2, ln 60-64). In addition, Anderson et al. disclose displaying of the job status, such as number of page remaining and etc. for providing user feedback (i.e. col. 2, ln 61-63), and also allow the print job to be cancelled or interrupted at a specific “point” (or at specific page) or “simply automatically cancel the interrupt job” (i.e. col. 3, ln 13-17).

Anderson et al. and Turpin et al. do not explicitly disclose the limitation of “the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected form the document data”.

However, Johnson et al. disclose an invention relates to the printing control involves detection of “backchannel data”, and further utilize the information of presence or absence of a requesting command for “backchannel data” as the control signal for interrupting or halting control of printing processing (*see Johnson et al., i.e. Para. [0037] - [0038] and [0040] - [0042]*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. to include the limitation of “the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected from the document data” taught by Johnson et al. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. by the teachings of Johnson et al. to include the limitation of “the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected from the document data” taught by Johnson et al. to “make it possible for a printer to accommodate fast cancellation of print jobs, even when some print jobs request backchannel data” (*see Anderson et al., i.e. Para. [0042]*).

With regard to claims 30 and 31, the claims are drawn to a print processing control method according to claim 25. further requiring the process of halting to be initiated by either a user or upon a expiration of a specific time period as claimed in claim 30; and capability of halting either the print job for specific page or the print job as a whole as claimed in claim 31. In addition to the teachings disclosed by Anderson et al. indicated above, the prior art further discloses “the interrupt sequence queries the user for the interrupt copy job parameter...the user accepts the default setting and initiates the interrupt copy job by depression of a single button...” (*see Anderson et al., i.e. “Abstract”, ln 3-6*); and further discloses that the control signal could

Art Unit: 2625

also be rely upon the parameters, such as “approximate time left, etc.” (*i.e. col. 2, ln 60-64*). In addition, Anderson et al. disclose displaying of the job status, such as number of page remaining and etc. for providing user feedback (*i.e. col. 2, ln 61-63*), and also allow the print job to be cancelled or interrupted at a specific “point” (or at specific page) or “simply automatically cancel the interrupt job” (*i.e. col. 3, ln 13-17*).

Anderson et al. and Turpin et al. do not *explicitly* disclose the limitation of “the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected form the document data”.

However, Johnson et al. disclose an invention relates to the printing control involves detection of “backchannel data”, and further utilize the information of presence or absence of a requesting command for “backchannel data” as the control signal for interrupting or halting control of printing processing (*see Johnson et al., i.e. Para. [0037]-[0038] and [0040] –[0042]*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. to include the limitation of “the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected form the document data” taught by Johnson et al. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified Anderson et al. by the teachings of Johnson et al. to include the limitation of “the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected form the document data” taught by Johnson et al. to “make it possible for a printer to accommodate fast cancellation of print jobs, even when some print jobs request backchannel data” (*see Anderson et al., i.e. Para. [0042]*).

With regard to claims 37 and 38, the claims are drawn to a computer-readable storage medium stores a print processing control program according to claim 32, further comprising the

substantially identical limitations recited and discussed in claims 30 and 31 respectively (*The claims are rejected under the same ground for at least the reasons set forth above. See the detailed discussion of the claims 30 and 31 above; Further, Turpin et al. clearly disclose the implementation of the methods can be realized by program or software, i.e. GUI.*)

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-20, 22-25, 28-32 and 35-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- A. Lester et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0053110) disclose an invention relates to a printer is responsive to user input to cancel print jobs that are received after the user input.
- B. Mackawa (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0030836, Canon) disclose an invention relates to an image processing apparatus having an interrupting function for interrupting a print job which is being processed by an interruption job inputted from an external apparatus or a processing method of interrupting the print job which is being processed by the inputted interrupted job.
- C. Blom et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0099166) disclose a method of managing a print system in which print jobs are disposed with a print queue or "acting-object", is provided within the print queue to behave as a separate job.
- D. Yano (JP 2000-132347 A, Ricoh, a machine translation is provided and attached herein) disclose a method of a print job of plural pages is divided into the print job for the

Art Unit: 2625

respective pages, each being managed for the respective pages and efficient printing is realized.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacky X. Zheng whose telephone number is (571) 270-1122. The examiner can *normally* be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5 p.m., Alt. Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler M. Lamb can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jacky X. Zheng/

Examiner, Art Unit: 2625

July 25, 2008

/Twyler L. Haskins/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625